

Remarks

Claims 1-14 are pending.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by McLampy et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0114282).

It must be noted that the filing date of McLampy as a nonprovisional is April 27, 2001, which is after the filing date of the instant application of March 8, 2001. McLampy claims priority to a provisional application 60/254,840, filed December 11, 2000. However, subject matter contained in the nonprovisional application that was not disclosed in the provisional cannot be used as a prior art reference.

Applicant appreciates the detail of the Examiner's response. As stated in the text of the response, McLampy discloses five TRIBS at each node, associated with the relationship of the peer sending the message, such as adjacent external and adjacent internal input TRIBs, (internal and external referring to the domain), external adjacent and internal adjacent in per peer, and a external TRIB. The association between the TRIBs is based on the relationship of the peer, not on a particular VPN.

As amended, claims 1, 7, 11 and 14 more clearly state that the VPN is identified with a VPNID, and each TRIB is assigned a different VPN based upon the VPNID. As amended claim 1 requires, "defining a voice virtual private network having a virtual private network identification such that each virtual private network corresponds to one of the routing information databases, wherein each routing information database maintains information for the virtual private network having a given virtual private network identification..."

Claim 7 has been amended to require that the device have, "more than one routing information database wherein each routing information database is associated with a different virtual private network, the virtual private network identifiable by a virtual private network identification..."

Amended claim 11 requires that the instructions result in, "association of a different voice virtual private network with each routing information database such that each routing information database is associated with a different virtual private network by a virtual private network identification..."

Amended claim 14 requires that the device have, "means for defining a voice virtual private network such that each virtual private network corresponds to one of the routing information databases, wherein each routing information database is associated with a different virtual private network, the virtual private network identifiable by a virtual private network identification..."

As discussed above and referenced in the office action, Melampy does not disclose the TRIBs being associated with the VPNs by the VPNID, such that each TRIB is associated with a different VPN. The support for these amendments is found in several portions of the specification, including pages 5-6. It is therefore submitted that claims 1, 7, 11 and 14 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1, claims 8-10 depend from claim 7, and claims 12-13 depend from claim 14. These claims inherently contain all of the limitations of their respective base claims. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and is not considered pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

210 SW Morrison St., Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613